DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 341 AC 014 182

AUTHOR	Havens, A. Eugene
TITLE	Methodological Issues in the Study of Development.
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	49p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of Rural Sociology (Third, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August 1972)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Developing Nations; Disadvantaged Groups; *Economic Development; Labor Economics; Political Science; *Research Methodology; *Research Problems; Rural Development; Social Change; Social Problems; *Sociology; Speeches

ABSTRACT

The failure of development to improve the quality of life in most third world countries and in the less advantaged sectors of advanced capitalistic countries can be partially attributed, it is felt, to methodological errors made by those studying development. Some recent sociological approaches to the study of development are reviewed in this paper, and suggestions for clarification of the issues and approaches are made. Three major areas are discussed: (1) the definition of development; (2) the major approaches to the study of development--equilibrium models (behaviorists, psychodynamicists and diffusionists) and conflict models (structuralists--non-Marxist and Marxist); and (3) problems in analyzing relevant variables--confusion of structuralism with determinism, conceptualization, and the representativeness and validity of data. The economic situation of Colombia is described, and the five approaches are compared as to the treatment of 30 research questions relevant to the solution of Colombia's development problems. References are provided. (KM)

ED 072341

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT*

By

A. Eugene Havens**

It is appropriate, after concluding the "Decade of Development", to take stock of where the study of development has taken us and where it has gone wrong. That it has gone wrong is painfully obvious given the meager results of efforts to improve the quality of life in most third world countries as well as the attempts on the part of advanced capitalistic countries to enhance the life chances of their less-advantaged sectors. A portion of these mistakes may be attributed to methodological errors on the part of those engaged in the study of development. The present paper attempts to review some recent approaches to the study of development and suggest what future steps are needed to develop a clearer understanding of the issues and approaches to developmental concerns.

The bounds of the present study must be made clear. First of all, by methodology I do not mean research techniques. As used herein, methodology refers to the over all research process which includes assumptions, definitions, conceptualization, hypothesis testing, analyses, reformulation of hypotheses, retesting and the eventual statement of tentative conclusions and promulgation of public policy. I do not view this process as a step-wise, static approach, but rather an integrated process in which there is constant

---

* Paper prepared for the Third World Congress of Rural Sociology, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, August, 1972.

** Associate Professor of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

AC014182

confrontation between ideas and facts at every stage of the research process. The goal of the process is to bring about a closer congruence between consciousness and objective reality.

Such an approach is not amenable to what is currently in vogue -- the demand for rapid research results. Rather, it is a slow, meticulous, dedication to approaching reality not strictly for the sake of knowledge but to change reality through knowledge (Fals Borda, 1970a:59-86 and 1970b). Since the process, as I envision it, is both slow and committed, ideally one would hope that it was subscribed to not only by intellectuals but by all who either occupy, or aspire to, positions which enable reality to be changed. 1/

Within this ideological framework, the present study is also bounded by a focus on more sociological approaches to the study of development. Szentes (1971) has developed a remarkable analysis of the economic approach, and Bodenheimer (1970) and Huntington (1971) have provided a similar analysis of the political science approach. In order to analyze the sociological approach to development three major areas will be treated: 1) the definition of development, 2) the major approaches to the study of development, and 3) problems in analyzing relevant variables. I fully realize how ambitious this task is and have no illusions that I will accomplish it in this paper. Rather, I hope to present an outline of the issues and leave the rest to our discussions.

1/ With regard to the slowness of such a research process, Wright Mills (1953: 273) once said in a tongue-in cheek fashion about a design for studying Nazi Germany, "Of course, by the time we had gone through the three steps outlined, surely Hitler would have us in his clutches; but that is an irrelevant incident, and of no concern or consequence to the designer and methodologist of research, however, inconvenient it might be to the research worker". The point is that sometimes things are so blatently unjust that they require action not research.

While emphasis will be placed on studies of development that have been conducted by sociologists, this does not imply that development can be adequately understood from a narrow disciplinary perspective. Many times the processes understudy by sociologists are rooted in economic structures and, in turn, are institutionalized and defended by a state which represents these underlying economic interests. Thus, in the final section of the present study emphasis will be on an integrated approach to development rather than a strictly sociological one.

I. THE STARTING POINT: DEFINITION

All too frequently during the "Decade of Development" the major challenge facing the world was defined as increasing gross national product or disposable income per capita. Clearly, many argued that development should not be equated with economic development and economic development should not be equated with growth. Yet, in practice, this was what really occurred. Countries were classified as developed or underdeveloped on the basis of per capita income. Since many of the advanced capitalistic countries of the West headed the list under this definition of "development", it was relatively easy for scholars from these countries, either consciously or unconsciously, to equate "development" with Westernization under the label of modernization (Huntington, 1971).

It is beyond the scope of this paper to elaborate and defend an adequate definition of development. Moreover, Seers (197) has taken a major step forward in this effort. Essentially he argues that development involves

increasing output in all sectors of the economy and distributing this output in such a fashion so as to enhance the quality of life of the broad masses of the population. The emphasis on quality implies knowledge of what is versus what ought to be with major societal goals serving as the judgmental criteria for what ought to be. Many times societal goals are contradictory and, thus, different interests will advocate different normative perspectives. In this conflictive process of determining the goals and the means to attain them, the society's structure determines who participates in the process. However, what is at issue here is that whatever the definition one uses it is (1) a value judgment, and (2) influences one's approach in the empirical phase of development research. Each of these contentions will be briefly examined.

With regard to the issue of definitions as value judgments, Seers (1970:1) aptly argued "The starting point is that we cannot avoid what the positivists often disparagingly refer to as 'value judgments'. 'Development' is inevitably treated as a normative concept, as almost a synonym for improvement. To pretend otherwise is just to hide one's value judgments". What, then, are the sources of these value judgments that sociologists employ either implicitly or explicitly in their definitions?

First, and foremost, sociologists, being also human beings, are subject to the consequences of their own concepts. That is, sociologists are socialized into the mold of their discipline. There is an elaborate net work of rewards and punishments employed by faculties of sociology to assure that future sociologists have been properly socialized. Contemporary sociology has foundations and these were laid by European sociologists from 1830-1900 by such men as Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Simmel.

In order to understand these foundations, I have found Nisbet's (1966) notion of unit-ideas very helpful. This notion was borrowed from Lovejoy (1942:3) who argued that, "By this history of ideas I mean something at once more specific and less constricted than the history of philosophy. It is differentiated primarily by the character of the units with which it concerns itself.... In dealing with the history of philosophical doctrines for example, it cuts into the hard-and-fast individual systems, and, for its own purposes, breaks them up into their component elements, into what may be called their unit ideas."

The unit ideas providing the foundations of contemporary sociological approaches to development grew out of how the individuals forging them related to the three great ideologies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries: radicalism, liberalism, and conservatism. Thus the main unit ideas that still predominate in sociology may be viewed as "linked antitheses" that form the warp of the sociological tradition into which students are socialized: community society, authority power, status-class, sacred-secular, alienation progress (Nisbet 1966:7). Depending on how each sociologist relates to these ideological perspectives, his definition and, therefore, his approach to its study will vary. The plain truth is that, until very recently, the majority of sociological approaches lay much closer to the conservative end of the spectrum regardless of the political and scientific values of the principal figures because its essential concepts and its implicit perspectives placed it much closer to philosophical conservatism (Nisbet, 1966:17)

This contention could be demonstrated empirically if one were to analyze the professional ideology of social developers as Mills (1943) did for social pathologists. However, insofar as the concepts they select and the assumptions they make are based on both the foundations of sociology into which they have been socialized and their own moral convictions, the assertion is demonstrated in the following section of this report.

What I have been suggesting is that the history of science is analogous to the ideological struggles noted in politics. This is essentially what underlies Kuhn's (1962) distinction between "everyday" and "revolutionary" science: a paradigm is accepted by almost all the practising scientists in a given field. Investigations, which begin with definitions, are directed by and interpreted in terms of the paradigm. At times, however, the paradigm is overthrown. This happens not merely because some facts fail to corroborate certain theories. Theories can be modified and even discarded within a given paradigm. The throwing out of the paradigm (a scientific revolution) destroys the relevance of a whole class of problems (Rapoport, 1969:225). Sociology has not yet had its revolution so the principal source of its definitions remains basically conservative with regard to change and development.

The manner in which one defines development influences the entire research process. "In every field of study there are three basic questions which must be answered. First, what is the nature of the phenomenon in question? Second, what are the sources of its uniformities and variations? Third, what are the consequences of its existence or action?" (Lenski, 1966:21). It is important to note that these three questions must be

answered in the order given, since how one describes the nature of the phenomenon influences the types of uniformities and variations which are sought, and these in turn, influence the consequences observed. For example, if one defines development as growth, then you look for certain uniformities such as savings, investments, foreign loans, prices, effective demand and political stability. On the other hand, if the nature of development is described as justice and equality one looks at distribution, access to resources, life chances, patterns of concentration, and political change.

Obviously, the phenomenon of development should be defined so as to include both growth and distribution under periods of both stability and change in institutional arrangements. Recent efforts in sociology are beginning to define development in this fashion and select empirical measures that reflect this new definition (Drewnowski, 1970 and McGranahan, 1970). However, in order to fully explicate the relationship between the starting point, which I have argued to be definitions, and the subsequent course of the research process, we must look at the various approaches utilized by sociologists in their study of development.

II. MAJOR APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF DEVELOPMENT AND THEIR EMPIRICAL REFERENTS

The major approaches to the sociological study of development may be divided into two broad camps that roughly conform to the unit-ideas that form the foundations of sociology. These unit-ideas range from conservative to radical philosophical assumptions. In everyday terms these two broad camps are usually referred to as equilibrium models or conflict models.

Not every major work will fit nicely into one or another of these camps because: 1) sociologists tend to be ecletic and draw upon both approaches either in the same or in different studies, and 2) some sociologists have worked toward a synthesis of the two approaches (Van den Berghe, 1963 and Lenski, 1966).

It should be noted that classifying an individual's work as falling into one or another of these camps does not imply that they are all cut from the same mold. As Lenski (1966:22) noted, "Conservatives have not always agreed among themselves, nor have radicals. The only belief common to all conservatives has been their belief that the existing system of distribution was basically just; the only belief common to all radicals has been their belief that it was basically unjust. On other matters there has been no single conservative or radical position to which each and every adherent subscribed".

Nevertheless, there are some basic issues which delineate the two broad approaches. These issues are: 1) the nature of man, 2) the nature of society, 3) the degree to which systems of inequality are maintained by coercion, 4) the degree to which inequality generates conflict, 5) the means by which rights and privileges are acquired, 6) the necessity of inequality, 7) nature of the state and of law, and 8) the use of the concept of class (Lenski, 1966:22-23). Table 1 summarizes how the equilibrium and conflict approaches have divided on these issues.

The importance of Table 1 for this discussion is that most U.S. sociologists trained in the U.S., are socialized into the equilibrium approach as part of their training in the field. If one accepts the philosophical tenets of the equilibrium approach development issues become reduced to technical

solutions to the problem of increasing rates of growth. Assuming that relations are essentially harmonious and that inequities are part of life and the State exists to minimize (but never eliminate) inequities, there is no need to study the big questions. Therefore, there is a tendency to develop models of how to change individual behavior rather than institutions. Some individuals will change sooner than others (because they have more control over resources?) and will consequently, receive a greater share of short-run profits but these new income streams are accessible to all in the long run. The State, being benevolent, will assure that this occurs in the long run. Peter Sober is a benevolent dictator but Peter Drunk is a despot. A big question such as who keeps Peter Sober is rarely asked under the equilibrium approach because the problem is assumed away.

Three sub-categories of the equilibrium approach will be presented. Two of these (the behavioral and psychodynamic) are inherently models about individual behavior and not about macrosystems. Yet the authors of these models and their proponents claim that these models will resolve key development problems. How can models explain and change individual behavior resolve key development issues? They can if one believes the key assumptions of an equilibrium approach. Institutions as embodied in the State are inherently "good"; man requires restraining and control. Thus, the key development problems involve individual behavior.

For our purposes, the broad categories of equilibrium and conflict approaches are the starting points for the classification of approaches to the

study of development. As noted earlier, within these two broad divisions there are internal divisions. Therefore, I have sub divided the equilibrium approach into behaviorists psycho-dinamicists, and diffusionists and the conflict approach into structuralists-non Marxist and Marxist. A word of caution is still needed however. Any classification system is a research device. It does not exist in its pure form in reality. Neverthe less, to assist the reader I have classified some major sociological works into these five categories to aid in identifying the differences in approach.

Table 1. Differences in Assumptions Between the Equilibrium and Conflict Approaches to Development*

Issue	Approach: Equilibrium	Conflict
1. Interests	Uniting	Dividing
2. Social Relations	Advantageous	Exploitative
3. Social Unity	Consensus	Coercion
4. Society	System with needs	Stage for class struggle
5. Nature of Man	Requires Restraining Institutions	Institutions Distort Basic Nature
6. Inequality	Social Necessity	Promotes Conflict and is Unnecessary
7. State	Promotes Common Good	Instrument of Oppression
8. Class	Hueristic Device	Social Groups with Different interests

* Derived from Lenski (1966), Dahrendorf (1958), Van den Berghe (1963) Horton (1967) and Adams (1967).

Table 2, presents the five categories, their major assumptions and concepts and indicates works that fall into these categories. Another point should be clarified. The assumptions listed in Table 2, do not include those in Table 1. That is, the three different approaches within the equilibrium model are assumed to share those mentioned for that approach in Table 1. Thus, the assumptions in Table 2, are at a lower level but differentiate the sub-approaches within the equilibrium model. The same holds for the two different approaches under the general conflict model.

Table 2, is too condensed to fully explicate the differences in the approaches. Therefore, each one will be briefly described, and under each, an indication will be made of the kinds of research questions asked. In all three sub-approaches of the equilibrium model, we find the following commonalties. First, society is the social system that is a transcendent entity beyond the particular individuals that comprise the system. Nevertheless, the social system describes "links" among men, "patterns" of behavior, "systems" of action, and social relations (Leach, 1961; Nadel, 1947 and Levi-Strauss, 1963).

Second, since systems strive to maintain equilibrium, there is a tendency to view change as a result of external causes (Levi-Strauss, 1963:309). Firth (1951:35) argued, consequently that a "structural analysis cannot interpret social change" while hedging and saying that this is due to the researchers conception of social systems as undifferentiated units which leads to a disregard of internal dynamics. Nevertheless, very few studies that employ the equilibrium model view structure as being directly amenable to change. Other factors are considered to be the dynamic aspects of change.

Table 2. Major approaches to the Study of Development with Attendant Assumptions and Concepts

Types of Approaches to the Study of Development	Major Assumptions	Frequent Concepts
I. EQUILIBRIUM MODELS		
A. Behavioral Kunkel (1970), Lipset (1967), Homans (1961), Parsons (1960), Erasmus (1961), Eisenstadt (1966)	Individuals suffer deprivations that are contextually determined; behavior can be changed at any time, development will occur through new learning experiences.	Modernization, learning curves, internalization, deprivation, attitudes, values, rationality, adult socialization, intra-generational change.
B. Psychodynamic Hagen (1962), McClelland (1961)	Early childhood socialization largely predetermines future behavior which may inpede innovativeness, cleavage between individual behavior and current social environment; development occurs through new socialization patterns.	Personality, backwardness, childhood experiences, status withdrawal, inter-generational change, modernization.
C. Diffusionist Rostow (1971), Hirschman (1958), Barnett (1953), Rogers (1969), Hoselits (1960), Levy (1966)	Simplistic dualism-societal cleavage based on degree of use of modern technology, development occurs through new capital and technological inputs.	Diffusion curves, rates of change for ecological units, lagging sectors, productivity, technological growth, modernization.
II. CONFLICT MODELS		
A. Structuralist-Non Marxist Dahrendorf (1959), Heilbroner (1963), Aron (1962), Prebisch (1970).	Impossible to predict historical outcomes; no revolutionary upheavals necessary for development, parties represent class interests to seek new equilibriums under Pareto-better solutions; moving equilibriums, class formation not related to mode of production, rate	Pluralism, conflict, conflict-management, strata, means ends, institutional reform, power, structural dualisms, structural change.

Types of Approaches to the Study of Development	Major Assumptions	Frequent Concepts
	of change dependent on intensity and violence of class conflict.	
B. Marxist Szentes (1971), Mafeje (1970), Baran (1957), Dos Santos (1970), Sunkel (1970)	Mode of production underlies economic actions and class structure; at level of social formation various classes may be present depending on group's relationships to means of production; if tendency to move to a two-class structure occurs at level of social relationships, there will be a change in the mode of production. Changes related to intersocietal historical relationships in the development of the mode of production.	Imperialism, ownership of the means of production, concentration of resources, proletarianization, pauperization, class formation, class consciousnes, class struggle, development.

This assumption leads to the third major unifying elements of the three sub-approaches in the equilibrium model. A major independent role is given to the effect of values in fostering economic development. This, in turn, leads to the fourth unifying element. Structural conditions make economic development possible; cultural factors determine whether the possibility becomes a reality (Lipset, 1967:5).

Consequently, there is a tendency for a fifth unifying element. Development tends to become equated with growth, which, in turn, is brought about by changing people to conform to extant institutions as opposed to qualitative changing

institutional arrangements. Thus, modernization is the key to development, or is development and is brought about by "Westernizing" underdeveloped lands (Huntington, 1971).

While the above mentioned elements unify the second-level set of assumptions within the equilibrium camp, other lower level assumptions separate them and bring about different research questions and specifications of policy.

A. The Behaviorist Approach (An Inherently Individual Approach)

The major tendency of the behaviorlist approach is to draw upon one or more learning theories for their concepts and measures (Bandura, 1969). The following central assumptions have been developed and presented by Kunkel (1970:23).

1. Individuals are subject to conditions of physiological deprivation and satiation.

2. Some types of deprivation and satiation are learned and have a cultural origin.

3. The effectiveness of action varies directly with the level of deprivation and inversely with the level of satiation of the individual.

4. If in the past, in a certain context, a behavior pattern has been rewarded, the possibility that the same behavior pattern will be emitted in the future, under similar circumstances, is increased.

5. The converse is also true, past behavior that was punished is less likely to recur under similar circumstances.

6. The specific components of rewarding and punishing consequences of actions are functions of the social context and may be expected to vary among individuals and over time.

7. The major implication for development analysis, and especially for the formulation of action programs, is that behavior can be changed at any time.

8. By judiciously altering those aspects of the social environment which constitute rewards and punishments, it is possible to alter behavior patterns and to initiate or accelerate social change.

Such a set of assumptions concerning change leads to the use of the concepts identified in Table 2. These concepts lead in turn to a certain set of research questions. Examples of these research questions are:

1. What are the principal reference groups employed by a given individual?

2. To whom, or to what group, does the individual take his cues for behavior?

3. To what extent does the individual feel relatively deprived in relation to his significant others?

4. What action does the individual take to reduce his feelings of relative deprivation?

5. How is deviance viewed by the significant others?

6. What are the legally defined limits of deviation?

7. What are the socially acceptable norms of evasion that the individual may employ?

8. What are the relationships between social values and innovative behavior?

9. How is innovative behavior rewarded or punished?

10. What role do the major political institutions play in changing legally defined rewards and punishments?

This list of questions is not meant to be exhaustive but rather indicative of the sorts of data sought to be the behaviorists. As can be seen, there is a strong individual bias employed by those who subscribe to this approach while arguing that behavior must always be viewed in a social context and a time perspective. The ultimate source of data, however, is the individual. This approach could not be better summarized than by one of their spokesman who said, "the great dramas of societal transition occur through individuals involved in solving their personal problems and living their private lives" (Lerner, 1958:74).

B. The Psychodynamic Approach (Another Inherently Individual Approach)

The psychodynamic approach emphasizes man's internal state and explains behavior in terms of his internal characteristics. Kunkel (1970:19) again has provided us with a summary of the general propositions employed by sociologists who subscribe to this approach.

1. Men are born with certain internal elements such as drives, needs, instincts, libido, etc.

2. Societal norms and values are internalized and may limit or modify some of these elements.

3. The resulting combination of original and modified elements, together with internalized societal factors, form an internal state usually called personality, which is the major determinant of action.

4. A stimulus impinging upon a person causes a state of tension (or disequilibrium) in the internal state (which is unpleasant).

5. Behavior is a consequence of the individual's and personality's tendency to return to a state of equilibrium (which is pleasurable).

6. The social context which is introduced into the system is that of childhood.

7. Thus, the internal state, much of it unconscious, is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to change in later life.

8. Consequently, an individual's actions are often quite independent of his adult social environment.

The methodological problems involved in this approach have been well documented by all those who criticize the validity of psychoanalitic techniques. It is worth noting that the ultimate defense employed by the adherents of this position is that those who haven't been trained in psychoanalytic techniques are unqualified to criticize which, to me, appears as dogmatic as those who argue that if you are not an orthodox Marxist you are a revisionist. In any event, the sorts of questions asked by these researchers are indicated by the following list.

1. What were the early childhood experiences of the individual?

2. How were these experiences internalized and organized into personality?

3. What sort of internal responses (anxiety, rage) do current social contexts trigger?

4. What are the consequences of these internal tensions on the part of adults for the socialization of the succeeding generation?

5. What sort of intensive, individual treatment is required in order to make adults responsive to developmental needs?

6. What have been the long run trends (over several generations) with regard to personality formation?

The methodological issues raised by this approach are intricate and complex but the severity of them may be raised. First, the internal state cannot be studied directly. Most of its components are devoid of empirical referents. Current research procedures do not provide measures of many of the internal processes assumed to be operating (Kunkel, 1970:22).

Secondly, the causal relationships between observed behavior and the assumed characteristics of the internal state are almost impossible to validate. Consider the following passage from Hagen (1962:136).

> There is a still more subtle and compelling reason for his partial identification with his father. Along with his love and admiration for his father, the boy is jealous of him and hates him. But if he perceives that his father loves and values him, this hatred and jealousy cause the boy to feel guilt.... To protect himself from this guilt and fear of rejection, he incorporates into his own personality standards of conduct which he believes to be those of his father. By doing so (a) he tries to prove to himself that since he is like (or is) his father, he cannot really hate his father, and so need not feel guilty, and (b) he tries to reassure himself that since he is his father, his father does not really wish to reject him.

The empirical referents for this sort of speculation regarding the internal state of the boy are difficult to imagine.

C. The Diffusionist Approach

Most sociologists employing the diffusion approach subscribed to the equilibrium assumptions outlined in Table 1. Thus, they view interests of all members of a given society as essentially uniting and current institutional arrangements controlled by a government that is attempting to promote the common cause. Consequently, the introduction of a new technology, either foreign or indigenous, may cause temporary imbalances that will soon be restored to a new equilibrium that embodies a more equalitarian distribution of benefits.

This approach, while adhering to the general tenets of equilibrium theory, represents an entirely different approach to development. The major differences in the diffusionist approach are summarized by its adherents central assertions.

1. The central problem in development is increasing productivity.

2. Development occurs largely through the spread of certain cultural patterns and material benefits from the developed to underdeveloped areas.

3. Within each underdeveloped nation a similar diffusion occurs from the modern to the traditional sectors.

4. The traditional (or backward) sector serves as a brake on the modern sector and, thus, limits development.

5. The major characteristics of the backward sector which inhibit over-all development are capital shortages, traditional attitudes, and low levels of functional literacy.

6. In order to assure rapid acceptance of modern techniques one should increase knowledge of their effectiveness and increase the risk-taking behavior of their potential users.

In many significant ways, it may be more correct to identify the diffusionist approach as a variant of the behaviorist camp. In fact, if my emphasis were on strictly theoretical underpinnings, I would have classified it as such. In addition to the points listed above, most diffusionists would subscribe to those outlined for behavioralists. Nevertheless, with regard to research emphasis, they give much more attention to the above points. The sorts of research questions they ask are indicated in the following list:

1. What is the technological inventory of a given society or sector of society?

2. Within a sector, or society, what are the traditional areas?

3. How does a new technique become diffused?

4. Who are the early adopters of new techniques?

5. How do the early adopters vary in their social and economic characteristics from later adopters?

6. What is the major source of new techniques? Are they national? Or are they diffused cross-culturally?

7. What sort of a technological inventory is required for a society to be classified as modern?

There is probably no other area in sociology that has as full a repertoire of measurement and analytical techniques as the diffusionist approach. They have borrowed successfully from almost all areas of social and physical sciences for research designs, statistics and analytical approaches. Experimental designs have been frequent (Rogers, 1969).

The major issue in the diffusionist area is related to our starting point -- what is development and how does it proceed? For example, it is commonly assumed that progress has occurred through the spread of the material and cultural advances of the modern sector to the traditional, and that the former contributes to the latter. This underlies Hirschman's (1958) notion of linkages between leading and lagging sectors; and Rostow's (1971) "take-off" is initiated by the transmission of "expansionary forces" from the primary growth sectors to other economic sectors. At the cultural level, the spread of "modern" entrepreneurial attitudes is generally thought to stimulate development in traditional sectors (Hoselitz, 1960).

Two recent critiques of these assumptions argue the exact opposite (Gunder Frank, 1967 and Bodenheimer, 1970). These critiques point out that some studies indicate that the developed sectors have blocked progress in the traditional sectors and have advanced materially only at the expense of and through the exploitation of the latter. Human and material resources have diffused backward to the modern areas, causing a decapitalization and impoverishment of the less developed areas (Stavenhagen, 1968). The same sort of a relationship holds for the flow from underdeveloped countries to the advanced capitalistic countries (Gunder Frank, 1969:315-318). These issues take us logically into the other major approach to development studies.

At the outset of the present section on approaches, it was suggested that the major distinction between equilibrium models and conflict models was based on conservatism and radicalism. There is another alternative: Liberalism. Thus, I have divided the conflict approach into structuralist-non Marxist, and Marxist.

D. Structuralist-Non Marxist

Table 2 adequately presents the main characteristics of this approach. Its principal ones are presented by Dahrendorf (1958).

1. All units of social organization are continually changing, unless some force intervenes to arrest this change.

2. Change is ubiquitous.

3. Conflict is ubiquitous.

4. Social conflict is a creative force.

5. Societies are held together not by consensus but by constraint, not by universal agreement but by the coercion of some by others. There is a

distinctly liberal bent here. There is a basic acceptance of the extant structure of the state and economy, thus revolution is not indispensable for freedom, nor is conflict avoidable. Nevertheless, institutions could fetter individual freedom. When this occurs conflict arises which then becomes the motor for reform which will restore, for a time, the individual's political, civil and social rights. While the followers of this approach seem to reject the notion of a moving equilibrium I have included it as one of its characteristics.

The reason I have included it is that most followers of this camp believe that man's social welfare can be improved but equality is an unattainable goal. In fact, social organization requires authority and the exercise of power. Thus, if an improvement occurs, it merely moves the entire stratification system up to a higher plane but it does not necessarily reduce the distance from the top to the bottom. Granted the non-Marxist structuralists do not posit a gradual upward spiral but, rather, distinct qualitative jumps. Nevertheless, at any giving point in time, the groups in conflict are moving away from a given set of arrangements (an equilibrum?) toward a new set of arrangements (a new equilibrum?) usually by creating crises. Thus, I have called this a crisis equilibrum for I see no methodological distinction.

This main distinction is how the equilibrum moves and what causes it to move. Under the equilibrium approach, there is a tendency to assume that social relations have a normal movement towards balance. The abnormal is severe imbalance. There is a general upward spiral that is somewhat continued and this upward spiral is akin to earlier Spencerian conceptions of progress. Normal

conditions are described by a steady, not necessarily conflictive, movement towards new balanced states at a higher level that is quantitative and continous.

The structuralist-non Marxist would not subscribe to such a formulation. There is movement but the motor is conflict. Moreover, the movement, when it occurs, is discontinous and qualitative. It is somewhat akin to the economic notion of a quantum jump. The strain to maintain balance is so great that usually a crisis is required before basic changes are considered. Interim movement is quantitative but the major changes are qualitative.

Some of the questions asked by the adherents to this approach are:

1. For any given point of time, what different groups are in conflict?
2. What are the different interests of these groups?
3. What are the authority relations between these groups?
4. What are the dependency relations between the conflicting groups?
5. How intense is the conflict?
6. How violent is the conflict?
7. What are the coercive forces attempting to contain the conflict? What arbitrations are under way?
8. What have been the historical results of previous conflict resolution?
9. Whose liberties are being infringed? Who is defending these liberties?
10. What are the organizational variables that are brought into play in the attempt to change dependency relations and, thus, power relations?

The methodological issues involved in the present approach tend to center around the problem of structural variables or what some refer to as the problem of aggregation. Almost invariably, researchers have resolved this by

summing individual responses. This solution, of course, raises the ancient ghosts of the issues of nominalism and realism. More important, however, is the question of how to weight individuals in the process of developing group attributes. If individuals vary in their influence and occupy different authority positions, then, their decisions have consequence for others to a greater degree than those seeking influence. There is the problem of what constitutes a class in the sense used by the structuralist non-Marxists. What if individuals are unaware of their common interests? Or what if they are aware of them but do not desire to participate in programs to further their interests? Are they still grouped together for analytical purposes? And, finally, there is the question regarding the violence of conflict. Which is more violent, starving to death or being shot? Many of these subtle issues have not been adequately confronted. In the final section of the present study some tentative suggestions for coping with some of these issues will be developed. But for the moment, attention is directed to the Marxists.

E. The Marxist Approach

There is a fundamental difference in approach as taken by Marxists with regard to development. Our concern, herein, is not to fully outline the approach but, rather, to highlight this fundamental difference. First of all, Marxists tend to conform much more closely to the ideal-typical characteristics of the conflict approach outlined in Table 1. For them, these assumptions are based on demonstrable, objective facts of history. Man has exploited man; the State does represent and attempt to maintain the dominant class position; and the institutions promulgated by the State do fetter the majority of the broad

masses in the historical development of the pre-capitalist and capitalist systems. Thus, the approach is truly structural and causes of development are sought in the institutional arrangements themselves and not in strictly individual characteristics. The sorts of research questions asked are indicated in the following list. In preparing this list, I have drawn heavily on Zeitlin (1967:152-155).

1. What is the nature of the economic order and, within it, the shpere of production of the society in question? For example, how does new technology affect the level of production? Is unemployment rising or declining? To what extent are the main changes generalized or localized?

2. What are the major classes and how are they located in the economy? What are the objective interests of the main classes and strata? For example, do the direct producers own or control the tools and other means of production? Does there exist an economic surplus of material goods over and above the subsistence requirements of the producers? Who has control of the surplus? How is it used and which classes benefit most directly from it?

3. Are class members aware of their objective position in the economic structure and the extent to which it determines their life chances?

4. What form does conflict take among the main classes? Within the classes?

5. What is the role of the <u>lumpen proletariat</u>? How does it existence affect the other classes? Which classes exploit its existence for their own political ends?

6. Which parties are in power? What is their relationship to the respective classes? Who controls the military, the police, etc?

7. What is the tendency toward concentration of resources? Who controls these resources? What proportion of these resources are controlled by international interests?

8. How do the external relations of a society affect its development?

The above should be sufficient to indicate the basic methodological differences in this approach. The objective is to view men in the totality of their social relations. In the other approaches to development, there was a tendency for society to be taken for granted and ignored. In the Marxian approach, the amassing of small truths about the various parts and aspects of society can never yield the big truths about the social order itself or as Baran and Sweezy (1966:3) indicate, "how it got to be what it is, what it does to those who live under it, and the directions in which it is moving. These big truths must be pursued in their own right and for their own sake".

Herein lies the nub of the methodological problems of Marxism and, I believe, of the problems confronted in the study of development. For if development is defined so as to include basic social justice or as Marx put it "the liberation of man", then one must study society in its totality and how men are fit into this totality.

Thus, such an approach to development properly places emphasis on structural relationships and how they affect man in his struggle for liberation. Structuralism is a <u>methodology</u> and not a philosophy. The danger with structuralism is that the tendency exists to treat it as determining man's present <u>as well as his future behavior</u>. There is no question that structural relations impose limits on individual and group behavior at any given

point in time. But structural analysis need not be static nor emphasize the sameness in all social relations. Throughout history great men do emerge, people's perceptions do change, objective class interests are transformed into subjective, political action, and contradictions do exist in structural arrangements. In brief, structuralism should not be confused with determinism. Treated as method, it provides an analytical idea of totality.

There is another danger if the Marxian approach is misinterpreted. This danger concerns Praxis (Birnbaum, 1969:39). Basically, the notion of Praxis argues that a totally detached or objective science of society is impossible. It does not, however, imply that all social science has to be "engaged" in any direct sense, but assertations to this effect have lead some "scientific" study on the part of Marxists to be reduced to the state of propagandizing just as much as a large part of Rostow's (1971) recent work in an obvious attempt to justify the Johnson Administration. What Praxis does imply is the examination of the moral and political implications of existing forms of social organizations.

These may appear as unduly abstract issues but they operate at an almost everyday level. How can one be committed and in the heat of the battle still retain critical, analytical ability? How does one become involved in structural relations and still avoid structural determinism? And, equally problematic, how can sociology develop analytical frameworks for the discovery of the totality of social relations?

The critical issue facing researchers who wish to study development utilizing a total approach is to determine what the essential elements are that should be included in the analysis. The two questions to be asked are: 1) What is the precise problem being investigated, and 2) what are the essential elements of the problem?

These, of course, are not new problems. They are at the very core of scientific analysis. Hegel (1937:65) presented the problem in these terms, "in the process of scientific understanding, it is of importance that the essential should be distinguished and brought into relief in contrast with the so-called non-essential. But in order to render this possible we must know what is essential". Scientific methodology has no mechanical solution to these issues. In fact, in a very significant (and, I believe, healthy) sense each individual researcher is allowed to resolve the issue of what is essential on his own. His only obligation is to report the steps he took in reaching this decision; that is, what he disregarded and why.

In every day practice, the problems of what to study and what is essential in studying it are generally referred to as conceptualization. The hypotheses formulated and tested, and the conclusions drawn are checked against the data of experience (Dewey, 1938). To understand the achievement of a particular scientist, or group of researchers, we must try to identify their conceptualization, where it came from and how they developed their inferences. This was the object of the previous section of the

present study. Unfortunately, in too much of modern sociological research, the stages of the research process are considered to be simply that -- stages. Once the initial conceptualization is completed it is set aside. Inconsistent data in the analysis stage are rationalized away or ignored without requestioning the initial conceptualization. In the study of total relations, this cannot be tolerated. Conceptualization can never end; it must be a dynamic process that is present in every step. Every piece of data must be evaluated with regard to its consequences for the initial conceptualization. This, I believe, is the only way in which one can begin to determine what is essential and what is not and, thus, contribute toward an integrated study of development.

Such an argument does not imply that we must begin anew with every research study we undertake. Knowledge is cumulative and we can draw upon this codified knowledge as our point of departure and we must return to it as our test of validity for the conclusions drawn. This is what is meant by checking conclusions against the data of experience.

This sort of research is not done overnight. It requires slow, painstaking, deliberate thought. There is no such thing as closure; in reality a research project never ends except for those false termination points called publication dates, termination of grants, and considerations for promotion. There is no implicit plea here for the publication of only "classics". Publication is a valuable means of broadening critical analysis of what are the essential elements to be considered.

After our initial determination of what the problem is and what its essential elements are, we are faced with the question of how to proceed. It is often argued that Marx employed an abstract-deductive method. In

present day terms he employed the method of successive approximations which consist in moving from the more abstract to the more concrete in a step-by-step fashion removing simplifying assumptions at successive stages of the investigation so that theory may take account of and explain an ever wider range of actual phenomena" (Sweezy, 1968:11).

What is involved in this approach is the specification of the problem at its most abstract level then deducing what should be the observable consequences at successively lower levels. It does not imply that findings at each lower level are not employed to redefine the original abstraction. One of the chief problems in such an approach is that of completeness of data.

The problem of completeness of data, fortunately, involves the question of choice of the objects to be studied. In most cases of sociological analysis, one has to deal with processes expressed in terms of an overwhelming number of facts. Consequently, we are faced again with what is essential. What is at issue is the question of representativeness of the objects chosen and the validity of extrapolation of knowledge of a part upon the whole. Lenin suggested that "The optimal scale and character of a sampling are largely dependent upon the prevalence of the phenomenon and the rate at which it develops. Thus, for example, study of a new and relatively less widely prevalent phenomenon requires the greatest completeness of factual data. For a well-developed and widely disseminated phenomenon, the volume of data can be comparatively small" (Larionov, 1969:86).

At first glance, it would appear that those of us interested in development could be saved since it (or the lack of it) is a widely disseminated phenomena. But when we attempt to synthesize previous research findings

another problem emerges -- that of comparability of indices. Indices, if comparable, must be of the same order. For example, one should not compare all farms within a given geographical area since they undoubtedly exist under different social conditions and different types of farm organization. Moreover, there must be comparable units of measurements. For example, if the criteria for determining the economically active population change from one census period to another, comparisons of unemployment rates are impossible. Sometimes it is possible to construct new derivative groupings which will allow comparisons.

These methodological issues are some that I consider to be of paramount importance for the study of development. There are many others which are of a more technical nature such as indexing, statistical inference, and multi-dimensional scale building. But since they are technical, I have less concern for their resolution. That is, we seem to have more technological skill than conceptual skill necessary for integrated approaches. As is obvious from the above, I think we need a "scientific revolution" in sociology with regard to the major paradigm that has been employed by, at least Western scholars.

In present-day terminology, the key question involves how to develop macro-level understandings when almost all of our data sources are drawn from the micro-level. In my own thinking I have found an often-over-looked article by Mills (1953) to be of great value. In his words, "only by moving grandly on the macroscopic level can we satisfy our intellectual and human curiosities. But only by moving minutely on the molecular level can our observations and explanations be adequately connected. So if we could

have our cake and eat it too, we must shuttle between macroscopic and molecular levels in instituting and explaining it -- developing the molecular index structure of general concepts and the general conceptual implications of molecular variables" (Mills, 1953:271).

To me, Mills has adequately expressed the challenge, as others before him have expressed it. As indicated in the first section of the present study, sociology, with but a few notable exceptions usually from non-Western countries (Dos Santos, 1970, Sunkel, 1970, Szentes, 1971 are examples) has largely ignored the challenge. Hopefully, future sociologists will not.

What is being called for is a recasting of the various pieces of knowledge that we have concerning development into an applied, integrated approach. This process must begin with a definition of development that looks at societal goals and how we achieve them. Based on this definition, it is necessary to decide what key concepts must be incorporated into the model and how they are interrelated. In drawing upon previous studies we must determine what is significant which is, in part, determined by the definition of development and the initial conceptualization. However, as analysis proceeds this conceptualization may require modification. And finally, we must integrate these pieces of knowledge not only into a total picture of the development process but, at the same time, indicate at what level change may proceed. These, I believe, are the key problems we are facing and those which we must address in this seminar. And I believe the Marxist approach will provide the greatest insights regarding how to best approach these problems.

DEMONSTRATING THE DIFFERENCES IN APPROACH

There is no successful way to conclude a paper that, perforce, has had to briefly outline a series of different approaches and, then, suggest a number of problems with each approach. A conclusion of a truncated analysis is not very satisfactory. Consequently, I will briefly describe the current situation of a given country, indicate the sorts of relevant issues that might be considered in development, and finally indicate which of these issues would "normally" be considered by each of the five approaches outlined in the present study. The country to be considered is Colombia, South America.

There is no doubt that Colombia is a capitalistic country that has eliminated almost all vestiges of its earlier mercantilist and dualistic economic structure. Even the poorest peasant is tied into the over-all economic structure through the market. However, Colombia's economic history presents some interesting differences in how the transition to capitalism occurred.

Until the cultivation of coffee, there was very little accumulation of capital in Colombia. During the colonial period, most economic surpluses were sent to Spain. Immediately following political independence, what wealth was generated was tied to crops produced for export -- tobacco, indigo, and quinine. These crops were developed and exploited by strictly national owners in rather isolated localities to such an extent that pockets of wealth were localized while the hinterland lived in the most abject squallor of poverty.

During the middle 1800's there was no notion of a national economic policy. Those who controlled the production of the export crops largely governed themselves, obviously for their own gain. Large landowners enjoyed a wealth of leisure but very little capital accumulation. Political parties emerged on rather sterile polemics and pure ideology but quickly began to protect economic interests as the national economy developed.

Local and national industry was emerging almost in spite of the overall economic chaos. Artesan industry was growing and profitable by 1850. Also the commercial sector was developing. And, of course, there existed the latifundistas who were friends of the colonial economy with its feudalistic structure. As long as the national government, controlled entirely by the ruling class, took no direct economic decisions, these diverse economic interests were largely latent. It wasn't until free exchange was established that these economic interests emerged into political issues. The commercial sector favored free exchange, the artesans and small manufacturers favored protectionism, and the latifundistas favored maintaining the colonial structure.

The <u>political</u> decision to establish a free exchange economy had two major effects, one with rather limited consequences and the other which brought about a change in the entire economic system. The limited effect was the establishment for the first time in Colombia's economic history of a trade union to pressure for governmental action to protect economic interests. La Sociedad de Bogotá was formed to represent the interests of the artesans who were unable to compete with British products without protective tariffs.

Since the Sociedad was initially unsuccessful in changing the free exchange policy, many artesans and small manufacturers were forced to change their economic activities. They became coffee growers.

Coffee production was quite different from earlier export crops. First of all it was not regionally isolated but covered all parts of the mountainous area of Colombia which was the area most heavily populated. Secondly, coffee was not produced on large latifundias but on small colonized plots. Thirdly, European countries could not undermine Colombia's market position by producing coffee in their own colonies as they had done with tobacco and quinine. Coffee became a large producer of national revenues rather widely distributed throughout the country. In brief, coffee brought about a period of "rationalization" of the economy.

Specifically what occurred was the establishment of the Banco de la República to regulate the circulation of money. The Superintendencia Bancaria was created and charged with assurring that banks adhered to the monetary policy. New transportation and communication routes were required in order to ship coffee to the ports and in order to keep in touch with the New York markets. In brief, widespread coffee production marked the end of the colonial economy and the beginning of capitalism. New economic institutions were created to allow for the creation and accumulation of capital and all of this was done by Colombians with national economic interests and not by foreign investors or extractors. In fact, when foreign investors and extractors arrived in Colombia in the early 1900's (essentially from 1930 on) they encountered a set of capitalistic institutions already available to them.

Of course, accompanying these economic changes were changes in the class structure. Until coffee, the class structure was essentially comprised of landowners, slaves, and Indians. Towards the middle of the 19th Century cottage industry emerged with artesans and apprentices and finally a growing commercial sector. But coffee introduced a new phenomenon, an increasing internal market as well as a strong and large import-export economy. Thus, one encounters a merger of the large land owners interests with the large-scale commercial enterprises, the importers and exporters, and at a later date, the industrialists. This coalition of economic interests still exists today.

Colombia's economic situation is very similar today except that it is much more integrated into the world economy and is feeling the effects of modern technology and highly concentrated control over productive resources. Perhaps the best way to update this brief economic history is to quote from two sources talking about Colombia but from different perspectives. In this Introduction to Camilo Torres' work Zeitlin (1970) argues:

> Colombia's social structure is still essentially based on the large agrarian estate; nonetheless, the ruling class is a capitalist class -- but of a peculiar type: one whose extraction of the nation's wealth for its own benefit is based predominantly on its ownership and control of the land, and of the bulk of the financing, production, and sale of commercial --especially export--crops. Ramifying throughout the political economy, the interdepedent activities of merchants, coffee-exporters, millers, financiers, mineowners, large manufacturers, ranchers, sugar, coffee, and cotton-growers, as well as the state bureaucracy itself, bind them into a self-conscious ruling class.

In a similar vein, the U.S. Army Area Handbook states,

> The ruling class is largely united as to values and interests.... /as/ has frequently been revealed in the formation of inter-party coalitions, most recently in the National Front Government,

> for the purpose of resisting an extra-constitutional, strong-man form of government or revolutionary threats from below.... The important fact is that the differences have been of degree and have never been sufficiently wide to out-weigh the overriding consideration that the upper class maintain its dominant position.....' The armed forces (including the police), the Church and the educational system are all forms of this minority control.

Thus, there seems to be general consensus that Colombia's political economy is controlled by a small minority and its economic resources are highly concentrated. Gini coefficients for concentration of income, land and stock ownership in 1968 are .59, .81 and .95 respectively.

The problem presented by these concentration data, even if one wished to "develop" in conventional economic growth terms, is that Colombia's economy is geared to exports -- largely the export of a single crop, coffee. Thus, any fluctuation in coffee prices has tremendous reverberations in the economy. At best, relying on exports, given the uncertainty of international markets, seems to be a very shaky "engine of growth" given that the small farm sector operates so much at the margin it can not take advantage of new technology without a redistribution of productive resources. Moreover, the internal market is basically saturated since the income distribution is so skewed, the vast majority are unable to make significant purchases in the industrial sector simply because they don't have the money to do so.

Those who do accumulate capital tend to invest locally, if at all, in the business they know best: production of cash crops for export with capital-intensive enterprises thus limiting employment opportunities in the rural areas, limited processing of cash crops for the narrow internal

cash market, associated trade, and/or speculative real estate. Such an investment pattern tends to have two major consequences: it skews income distribution even more, and places more reliance on externally determined economic factors. For example, it is logical to expect that world market prices for agricultural raw materials will eventually tend to fall as competing producing countries not only in Latin America but also in Africa and Asia, all seeking more foreign exchange to implement their development programs, multiply their exports in the face of slowly-growing demand in developed countries. In the event that some comparative market advantages were to take place, those with already existing capital reserves would be the ones in a position to take advantage of this new market, and, in the absence of sufficient governmental controls, the results would be even further skewedness in the control over surpluses. In brief, without a redistribution of resources the internal economic situation of the country will worsen.

Colombia finds itself in such a situation at the present time. Cost of living has soared. The peso is over-valued. Unemployment is high. Coffee prices are dropping and are likely to continue to do so given the tremendous production increases that are occurring as a result of the introduction of Cafe Caturra -- a new coffee variety -- and increased fertilizer usage on the part of large coffee producers. External debt payments almost completely exhaust foreign exchange values when it is coupled with Colombia's imports which are largely manufactured and semi-processed goods for consumer industry. Internal revenues are currently about 12 billion pesos short of projected expenses.

One solution to the revenue shortage would be to generate revenues by a tax reform. However, the Colombian government has admitted publicly that tax enforcement and the burden of tax payment falls largely on those with the least ability to pay -- the salaried workers. It is precisely the salaried workers who have suffered under the current inflationary spiral. For example, the minimum salary guaranteed by the government for industrial workers is Pesos 17.30 per day while one kilo of cheese costs Pesos 22.00. Minimum wages for agricultural workers is Pesos 11.20 while the government established price for meat (when enforced) is Pesos 14.00 per kilo. Given that most rural workers' families average size is about six members, they don't eat much meat.

Attempts to generate foreign exchange revenues have been geared to exporting agricultural products. However, this has not been coupled with concern for internal demand and prices. An example is the significant jump in sugar and panela prices from 1962 to 1963. It was precisely at this time that Colombia's sugar quota was dramatically increased to offset the loss of the Cuban production. Colombia, always attempting to expand its exports, did so at the expense of national consumers. From 1962 to 1963 the value of Colombian sugar exports jumped by almost two and one quarter million dollars but internal prices doubled. Production between the two years remained almost constant. It wasn't until 1966 that a significant jump in production occurred. However, once again, Colombia's sugar quota increased and internal prices also increased.

One couldn't fault increasing foreign exchange revenues if this exchange value was re-invested in productive enterprises that benefited the

majority. Rather, these increased revenues were used to increase importation of raw materials, industrial and agricultural machinery. Such import substitution attempts apparently did not generate benefits that trickled down to the worker as the cost of living index indicates. Nor did it benefit agricultural workers. According to our field research, conducted in a sugar producing area of Colombia, real wages paid to workers declined by 15 percent.

In summary, Colombia's economic situation is best characterized by concentration of resources in foreign and national hands accompanied by a general trend toward proletarianization and pauperization of the broad masses.

Given this very brief description of the developmental situation of Colombia, Table 3 presents a list of 30 relevant research questions that I consider to be important to the resolution of Colombian development problems. Then, Table 3 indicates whether or not the five approaches described herein treats these issues. There is no intention to indicate that these are the only relevant questions or that the list does justice to all approaches. It is hoped, however, that it will serve to stimulate discussion on both topics: (1) what is relevant, and (2) can a given approach treat this issue without major modification?

Table 3. Example of Research Questions Treated by Five Different Approaches to the Study of Colombian Development

Relevant Research Questions	Treated by Approach*				
	Behaviorist	Psychodinamic	Diffusionist	Structuralist Non Marxist	Marxist
1. Control Over Economic Surpluses	0	0	*	**	***
2. Different Groups Perception of Above Control	0	0	*	**	***
3. Control Over Economic Institutions--especially markets	0	0	*	*	***
4. Technological Inventory	*	*	***	***	***
5. Contol Over (4)	0	0	**	***	***
6. Determination of how various groups view combined control of (1), (3) and (4)	*	0	**	***	***
7. Distribution of Productive Resources	*	0	**	***	***
8. Perception of (7) and how it Effects Class Formation	0	0	*	**	***
9. Analysis of Political Parties	*	0	*	***	***
10. Relationship of Party to Class	*	0	*	**	***
11. Use of Repressive Forces to Maintain Class Position	*	0	*	**	***
12. Who Controls Repressive Forces	*	0	*	**	***
13. Trend in Concentration of Control Over Productive Resources	*	0	*	**	***

Relevant Research Questions	Treated by Approach*				
	Behaviorist	Psychodinamic	Diffusionist	Structuralist Non Marxist	Marxist
14. Non-National Control Over Productive Resources	*	0	*	*	***
15. Effects of (14) on National Development	0	0	0	**	***
16. Non-Owner Control Over Distribution of Resources (Techno-Structure)	*	0	*	***	***
17. Level of Conflict Between Classes	*	0	*	***	***
18. How is Conflict Resolved	*	0	*	***	***
19. Who is Dependent upon Whom for Life Chances - Akin to (1), (3) and (5)	*	*	*	**	***
20. Who Uses new Technological Innovations	**	*	***	**	***
21. How is (20) Diffused	**	*	***	*	***
22. Who Developed new Technological Innovations	**	0	**	*	***
23. How do Users and Non-Users of Technological Inventory Differ: a) in personal characteristics	**	0	***	*	*
b) in relationship to means of production	*	0	*	**	***
24. What are the early Childhood Experiences of Members of Society	*	***	*	*	*
25. What are the Major Forms of Treating Personalities that are Non-Development Oriented a) Individual Treatment	**	***	*	0	0
b) Emphasis on Social Structure	*	0	*	**	***

Relevant Research Questions	Treated by Approach*				
	Behaviorist	Psychodinamic	Diffusionist	Structuralist Non Marxist	Marxist
26. What groups Orient Individual Behavior	***	0	***	**	**
27. How do Individuals Perceive Deprivation	***	*	***	***	***
28. What Actions do they Take to Reduce Deprivation	**	*	**	***	***
29. What is the Codification of Societal Values	***	***	***	**	***
30. How do Values Affect Individual or Group Behavior	***	***	**	**	**

*
The following key is employed:

0 = does not treat the question

* = can treat the question without major modification of approach

** = partly treats the question

*** = fully treats the question

Hopefully, Table 3 will stimulate our exchanges during the discussion that follows. It is an attempt to summarize the discussion of and issues presented in Tables 1 and 2. Consequently, if a given research question is classified as "*" -- can treat the question without major modification of approach -- implies that the basic assumptions do not preclude such a consideration. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the major assumptions would lead to the same prescription for actions to change the issue under study.

As indicated at the outset of the present study, I believe that researchers committed to changing extant conditions will contribute more to further defining the basic issues of development. Perhaps in the discussions that follow we can increase both committment and knowledge.

REFERENCES

Adams, Bert N.
1967 "Coercion and Consensus Theories: Some Unresolved Issues." American Journal of Sociology 73:714-717.

Aron, Raymond
1962 Dix-huit leçcons sur la société industrielle. Paris. Gallimard.

Bandura, Albert
1969 Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Baran, Paul A.
1957 The Political Economy of Growth. New York: Modern Reader.

Baran, Paul A. and Sweezy, Paul M.
1966 Monopoly Capital. New York: Modern Reader.

Barnett, Homer G.
1953 Innovation. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Birnbaum, Norman
1969 "The Crises in Marxist Sociology." in Hans Peter Dreitzel (ed.) Recent Sociology No. 1. New York· The MacMillan Company.

Bodenheimer, Susanne J.
1970 "The Ideology of Developmentalism: American Political Science's Paradigm Surrogate for Latin American Studies." Berkeley Journal of Sociology 15:95-137.

Dahrendorf, Ralph
1958 "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis." American Journal of Sociology 64:115 127.

1959 Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Societies. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Dewey, John
1938 Theory of Logic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dos Santos, Theotonio
1970 Lucha de Clases y Dependencia en Latinoamerica. Medellín: Oveja Negra.

Drewnowski, Jan
1970 Studies in the Measurement of Levels of Living and Welfare. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Eisenstadt, S. N.
1966 Modernization: Protest and Change. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Erasmus, Charles
1961 Man Takes Control. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fals Borda, Orlando
1970a "Algunos Problemas Prácticos de la Sociología de la Crisis" in Rosalia Cortés (ed.). Ciencias Sociales: Ideología y Realidad Nacional. Buenos Aires: Editorial Tiempo Contemporáneo.

1970b Ciencia Propia y Colonialismo Cultural. Mexico: Nuestro Tiempo.

Firth, Raymond
1951 Elements of Social Organization. London: Watts and Company.

Gunder Frank, Andre
1967 "Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology." Catalyst 3:1-67.

1969 Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America. New York: Modern Reader.

Hagen, Everett
1962 On the Theory of Social Change. Homewood: The Dorsey Press, Inc.

Hegel, Georg
1837 Philosophy of History. New York: World's Greatest Literature.

Heilbroner, Robert L.
1963 The Great Ascent: The Struggle for Economic Development in our Time. New York: Harper and Row.

Hirschman, Albert O.
1958 The Strategy of Economic Development. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Homans, George C.
1961 Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Horton, John
1967 "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies." American Journal of Sociology 73:701-713.

Hoselitz, Bert
1960 Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth. Glencoe: Free Press.

Huntington, Samuel P.
1971 "The Change to Change: Modernization, Development and Politics." Comparative Politics 3 (April): 283-322.

Kuhn, Thomas S.
1962 "The Structure of Scientific Revolution." International Encyclopedia of Unified Science 2:1 56.

Kunkel, John H.
1970 Society and Economic Growth. New York: Oxford University Press.

Larienov M. P.
1969 "On Methods and Methodology of Social Research in the Work of Lenin." Soviet Studies in Philosophy (Summer): 81-96.

Leach, E. R.
1961 Pul Eliya: A Village in Ceylon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lenski, Gerhard E.
1966 Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lerner, Daniel
1958 The Passing of Traditional Society. Glencoe: Free Press.

Levi-Strauss, Claude
1963 Structural Anthropology. New York: Basic Books.

Levy, Marion
1966 Modernization and the Structure of Societies. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lipset, S. M.
1967 "Values, Education and Entrepreneurship." in S. M. Lipset and Aldo Solarie (eds.), Elites in Latin America. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lovejoy, Arthur O.
1942 The Great Chain of Being. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mafeje, A. B. M.
1970 Sociology and Development. Dar Es Salaam: University of Dar Es Salaam.

McClelland, David
1961 The Achieving Society. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

McGranahan, D. V. and others
1970 Contents and Measurement of Socio-Economic Development. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Mills, C. Wright
1943 "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists." American Journal of Sociology 49 (September): 165-180.

1953 "Two Styles of Research in Current Social Studies." Philosophy of Science 20 (October): 266 275.

Nadel, Siegfried F.
1947 The Nuba: An Anthropological Study of the Hill Tribes in Kordofan. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nisbet, Robert A.
1966 The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Parsons, Talcott
1960 Structure and Process in Modern Society. Glencoe: Free Press.

Prebisch, Raul
1970 Change and Development: Latin America's Great Task. Washington D. C.: Inter-American Development Bank.

Rapoport, Anatol
1969 "Have the Intellectuals a Class Interest?" in Hans Peter Dreetzel (ed.), Recent Sociology No. 1. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Rogers, Everett M. with Lynn Svenning
1969 Modernization Among Peasants. New York: Holt, Rinehartand Winston.

Rostow, Walt W.
1971 Politics and the Stages of Economic Growth. New York: Oxford University Press.

Seers, Dudley
1970 "The Meaning of Development." Agriculture Development Council Papers and Reprints.

Stavenhagen, Rodolfo
1968 "Seven Fallacies about Latin America." in James Petras and Maurice Zeitlin (eds.), Latin America: Revolution or Reform? Greenwich: Fawcett Press.

Sunkel, Osvaldo
1970 "Desarrollo, Subdesarrollo, Dependencia, Marginación y Desigualdades Espaciales: Hacia un Enfoque Totalizante." Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano Regionales (Octubre): 13-49.

Sweezy, Paul M.
1968 The Theory of Capitalist Development. New York: Modern Reader.

Szentes, Tamás
1971 The Political Economy of Underdevelopment. Budapest: Akademiai Kiadó.

Van den Berghe, Pierre
1963 "Dialectic and Functionalism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis." American Sociological Review 28:695-705.

Zeitlin, Irving M.
1967 Marxism: A Re-Examination. Princeton: Van Nostrand.

ERIC Clearinghouse
MAR 7 1973
on Adult Education